

DSA

March 8, 1983

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 877

Meanwhile, the Soviets and their friends are well placed to cut off some supplies of critical materials almost at will and without directly involving the Soviet Union. The copper belt of Zaire and Zambia, source of most of the Western World's cobalt, is vulnerable to guerrilla raids, as was demonstrated in 1976.

Further, Gabon, a small country on the west coast of Africa, is the source of nearly half of the manganese used in the U.S. The Gabonese ore is shipped by rail through the Marxist country of Congo-Brazzaville to the port of Pointe Noire for loading aboard ships. The Congolese government earns useful foreign exchange for the shipping and handling of this ore, and in the past has expended its movement. The port of Pointe Noire is only a few miles from the Angolan enclave of Cabinda, where American-operated oil wells are guarded by Cuban troops, but where a separatist movement, working for the secession of Cabinda from Angola, is also smoldering. A risk to the manganese ore from Gabon could arise from any of several developments: a political decision by the Congolese under pressure from the Soviets to cut it off; a guerrilla raid from Marxist Angola or even sabotage of the rail line by the non-Communist separatists of Cabinda. At this writing, it appears to be everyone's interest to keep the manganese moving. How long that fortunate condition will prevail is anyone's guess.

In Southern Africa, the Soviets have sought to overcome their chronic shortage of hard currency (in other words, U.S. dollars) by developing barter. They have traded machinery, aircraft, power equipment, trucks, mining machinery and rail-road rolling stock for minerals and other commodities. The Soviet Union offers a large market for the tropical fruits and other agricultural products that are supplied to much of the West from Latin America and Asia. The barter pattern is one in which barter effectively replaces cash transactions, serving to exclude Western consumers from critical and strategic materials except on Soviet terms.

That is one definition of a Resource War.

# H.R. 1000—A BILL RELATING TO THE TRANSFER OF CIVIL LAND REMOTE SENSING SPACE SATELLITE SYSTEMS AND METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE SYSTEMS TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1983

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that addresses the issue of congressional oversight in the authorization of one of our Nation's essential governmental activities. These activities are the civil land remote sensing space satellite (Landstat) systems and the meteorological satellite (Metstat) systems.

As some of our colleagues know, the administration is presently giving consideration to the transfer of the Landstat and Metstat systems to the private sector. The commercialization of these systems clearly has many far-reaching implications for our citizenry, our

Nation, and the world. Consequently, it is imperative that we ensure congressional oversight for the necessary consideration, consultation, and deliberation that any commercialization proposals of this magnitude deserve.

In testimony before the House Committee on Science and Technology on March 2, 1983, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Dr. John V. Byrne, could not give unequivocal assurance that the administration would consult with the proper congressional committees before implementing proposals to commercialize the Landstat and Metstat systems. This indicates a real possibility exists for the administration to commence commercialization of these civil satellite systems without congressional review or approval. The legislation I am introducing today would require such authorization before either the Landstat or the Metstat systems, or any part thereof, could be turned over to the private sector.

The concept of commercialization of the Landstat and Metstat systems finds its roots in the Carter administration when endorsement was given to the proposal to transfer the Landstat system to the private sector. This proposal, however, was never vigorously pursued. In fact, it was assumed that the transfer to the private sector could not, as a practical matter, be accomplished until the 1990's at which time it was envisioned commercialization of the Landstat system would then be feasible.

A significant aspect of the Carter administration's commercialization initiative was that it never contemplated the transfer of the Metstat system to the private sector. This was simply because Federal users of the system's data, principally the National Weather Service (NWS), utilize 99 percent of the satellite remote sensing capabilities and 95 percent of derived data products. There are many indications that the Government will remain the principal user of the Metstat system's data for many years to come.

While unanswered questions are aplenty, the Reagan administration seems to favor commercialization of the Landstat and Metstat systems as soon as possible. This policy follows in the footsteps of an unheeded bid by the Communications Satellite Corporation (Comsat) in December 1981, which distinguished taking over both the Landstat and Metstat systems.

In June 1982, the Land Remote Sensing Satellite Advisory Committee (LRSSAC) recommended that the Commerce Secretary formally solicit industry inputs on the potential commercialization of these satellite systems. The original LRSSAC charter was to consider only matters concerning the Landstat system. However, the LRSSAC later passed a resolution designating the Commerce Department to formally test the feasibility of transferring all or part of both the Landstat

and Metstat systems to the private sector.

On September 10, 1982, a formal request for information (RFI) was issued by the Department of Commerce on the subject of turning these satellite systems over to the private sector. Fourteen responses to the RFI were received by the closing date of October 22, 1982. Among the respondents, a general consensus in support to the transfer of the Landstat system to the private sector emerged, but not with regard to the transfer contemplated within the administration. Thirteen, however, expressed opposition to the commercialization of the Metstat system altogether. Comsat was the only respondent expressing an interest in the commercialization of both the Landstat and Metstat systems.

The proposal submitted by Comsat envisions commercialization of both the Landstat and Metstat system. This proposal assumes a guaranteed market by the Federal Government to purchase data from the Metstat system for a contracted period spanning 15 years. This is the time frame Comsat deems essential before a viable market for the Landstat system data may be established. While this time frame may be correct, many people, in and out of Government, question the wisdom of Comsat's proposal to take over both the Landstat and Metstat systems.

Although premature, the administration's proposed transfer for commercialization is premature. The possible transfer of the Landstat and Metstat systems to the private sector involves fundamental issues of national policy, national security, international treaties, and socioeconomic factors. For example, this administration is known to oppose subsidization of any private organization taking over any of these systems. Yet the Government's investment in these satellite systems, exclusive of research and development, amounts to about \$1.5 billion. Recognizing that investment and then allowing the profit margin that a private satellite system would require is a tremendous undertaking for any private group to attempt.

It is argued by some that, by combining the Landstat and the environmental satellite into a single transfer to the private sector, sufficient efficiencies and revenues can be achieved to sustain both systems at a considerable savings to the Government. This implies large waste in the current system and the feasibility of combining ground and/or satellite systems to generate the funds to sustain Landstat. This will have to be examined thoroughly if such an assertion is made. Alternatively, in the event a large savings were not available, an untested, but plausible, premise is that simply increasing the cost of the weather satellite data to support Landstat cross-subsidizing would be unacceptable to Federal weather data users. Moreover,

E 878

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

March 8, 1983

any buyer would be required to submit themselves to being "authorized and supervised . . . by the Government to the extent required by treaty and national security." This treaty is the so-called Outer Space Treaty under which participating countries are each responsible for their own activities in outer space, regardless of whether such activities are carried out by a Government agency or not. U.S. investors anxious to recover their funds and turn a profit would probably be reluctant to have their daily activities monitored and possibly altered because of the national security demands of the military or the protests of foreign governments.

Finally, there is the crucial issue of rights and access to these systems data and data products. Answers to questions surrounding this issue have enormous policy implications. The value of information provided by these systems can be measured in national security as well as commercial terms. When it comes to weather data, such questions could affect American relations throughout the world where free data exchange has been the rule since Government weather services began. A private operation could change all that.

Admittedly, private industry's advances in satellite communications historically have come faster than those systems proposed by Government, notably the military. But those private efforts benefited greatly from federally sponsored R&D. The stakes I believe, are far too high to implement this policy without thorough congressional review.●

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE  
PREVENTION MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. "JIM" OLIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1983

● Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, children are one of the most vulnerable groups in our society, and too many of them suffer abuses. Today, I join my colleagues in supporting Senate Joint Resolution 21, designating April as National Child Abuse Prevention Month, as a means to call attention to the tragedy of child abuse and focus public attention on solutions.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has shown admirable sensitivity to the problems of child abuse and has adopted far-reaching programs to come to the aid of these small victims and their families. Virginia provides child protective services in every locality throughout the State, and the Department of Social Services offers mini-grants to communities for child abuse prevention programs. Last year, the Virginia General Assembly approved an increase in the marriage license fee, with the revenues to be used for child and spouse abuse programs.

This provides counseling, education, clinics, crisis assistance, and other programs to help victims of domestic violence.

Last year, Child Abuse Prevention Month was observed in Virginia with conferences, speeches, billboards, radio shows, and sermons. Many people gained a new awareness of the roots of family violence and ways to head it off. We cannot estimate how many troubled parents or concerned friends or relatives discovered that they could get help in fighting this tragic violence. I am sure the Commonwealth will match this success this year during Child Abuse Prevention Month.

One of our Nation's great leaders once said that the moral test of a society is how it treats "those in the dawn of life, the children . . . those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly . . . and those in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the unemployed."

Today we are calling on our society to help ease the suffering of the many Americans who become victims in the dawn of their lives.●

## TENNESSEE WILLIAMS

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1983

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a master of American drama, Tennessee Williams, who passed away last week at the age of 71. The world will truly miss the talents of this literary genius. Through his almost mythic characters, Mr. Williams offered insights into the human condition which reached deep into the hearts of readers and audiences throughout the world.

Bolting into literary prominence in 1945 with "The Glass Menagerie," Mr. Williams went on to establish himself as the dean of postwar American drama with such masterpieces as "A Streetcar Named Desire" and "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof"—both of which won him coveted Pulitzer Prizes. In his prolific career, he wrote an astounding 24 full-length plays whose cast of characters helped to highlight the careers of many distinguished actors including Marlon Brando, Jessica Tandy, and Burl Ives. His virtuoso command of dramatic technique and lyrical style colored the writings of many American playwrights.

Although he was plagued by various illnesses throughout his life, Tennessee Williams was compelled to create beauty and communicate tenderness in a world marred by savage cruelty. While his plays were often psychological explorations of dark landscapes populated by tragic outcasts, Mr. Williams nonetheless wrote with humor and extreme sensitivity.

Through characters such as Laura Wingfield and Stanley Kowalski, Tennessee Williams brought to life the exquisite pains and pleasures of being human. To quote Blanche DuBois, one of Mr. Williams most exciting creations, the "beauty of the mind and the richness of the spirit" found within the heart of his works, will grow with the years to enrapture audiences and readers for years to come. This is the legacy of Tennessee Williams.●

THE JOINT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT VENTURES ACT  
OF 1983

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1983

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the Joint Research and Development Ventures Act along with my colleagues, Congressmen DICK GEPHARDT, RON WYDEN, and ED ZSCHAU, to encourage greater U.S. research and development in the private sector by clarifying the application of antitrust laws to cooperative R&D ventures.

Our bill is based on three basic premises: The United States faces a tremendous challenge to remain the world leader in technology; the private sector is best equipped to meet this challenge; and our Government's role in helping the private sector meet this challenge must include a clarification of antitrust laws to dispel the uncertainty that presently inhibits American companies from mounting joint research and development ventures.

In a number of key industrial sectors, particularly in high technology, the U.S. export share of world markets continues to decline and parallels the profoundly ominous loss of markets here at home. To regain our competitive edge, we must—among other things—step up our R&D effort, particularly in the "leading edge" technologies that will be the building blocks of our future economy. Clearly, the private sector is best able to lead us into new areas; Government's role must be to help actualize the tremendous research potential that exists in U.S. industry.

The statistics are indeed astonishing; since 1962 U.S. spending on R&D as a percent of GNP has fallen by one-fifth; while in Japan the share of GNP devoted to R&D has increased by one-third.

Our Japanese and Western European competitors have adopted national programs to promote research and development as a key ingredient of their overall industrial policies. They expressly intend to challenge and ultimately overtake the U.S. lead in high technology by concentrating substantial resources upon research projects